



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,902	02/10/2004	Robert C. Stein	BCS03486	1206
7590	11/30/2005		EXAMINER	
Motorola, Inc. 101 Tournament Drive Horsham, PA 19044			FOX, BRYAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	
DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/775,902

Applicant(s)

STEIN, ROBERT C.

Examiner

Bryan J. Fox

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1 contains the limitation "said memory." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 8 contains the limitation "said commissioning data." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 15, 16, 19, 20 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kaupe (US 20020032028A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31), which reads on the claimed, "method for receiving commissioning data for connecting to a communication network via a wireless device." Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via

the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "establishing a commissioning session with the wireless device," and, "communicating commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device." The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed, "verifying security mechanisms with the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 2**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "communicating service provisioning data to the communications network via a network interface."

Regarding **claim 3**, Kaupe discloses the PDA communicates with the indoor device e.g. via Bluetooth signaling (see paragraph 28), which reads on the claimed, "establishing a commissioning session with the wireless device step comprises establishing a Bluetooth session with the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 5**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31), which reads on the claimed, "method for commissioning a network element in a communications network via a wireless interface." Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is

Art Unit: 2686

uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "initiating a commissioning session with the network element via the wireless interface," and, "communicating commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device." The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed, "verifying security mechanisms with the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 6**, Kaupe discloses that the installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed, "initiating a commissioning session with the network element via the wireless interface comprises generating a commissioning request for the network element."

Regarding **claim 7**, Kaupe discloses the PDA communicates with the indoor device e.g. via Bluetooth signaling (see paragraph 28), which reads on the claimed, "initiating a commissioning session with the wireless device step comprises initiating a commissioning session with a network element via Bluetooth technology."

Regarding **claim 9**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31), which reads on the claimed, "apparatus comprising commissioning data and service provisioning data for connecting to a communications network, said apparatus comprising: a wireless interface for receiving commissioning data from a wireless device; a network interface

Art Unit: 2686

coupled to the communications network.” Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, “said apparatus establishes a commissioning session with the wireless device,” and, “communicates commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device.” The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed device that, “verifies security mechanisms with the wireless device.”

Regarding **claim 10**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, “said apparatus communicates service provisioning data to the communications network via the network interface.”

Regarding **claim 11**, Kaupe discloses a wireless interface (see paragraphs 31 and 32), which reads on the claimed, “said wireless interface comprises an antenna,” wherein the wireless interface must include an antenna.

Regarding **claim 12**, Kaupe discloses the PDA communicates with the indoor device e.g. via Bluetooth signaling (see paragraph 28), which reads on the claimed, “said wireless interface comprises a BLUETOOTH wireless interface.”

Regarding **claim 15**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31), which reads on the claimed, "apparatus which may be commissioned for connection to a communications network via a wireless craft interface device, said apparatus comprising: a wireless transmitter for coupling with a wireless interface on the network element; and a connection." Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "said apparatus initiates a commissioning session with the network element via the wireless interface," and, "communicates the commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device." The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed device that, "verifies security mechanisms via the network element via the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 16**, Kaupe discloses the PDA communicates with the indoor device e.g. via Bluetooth signaling (see paragraph 28), which reads on the claimed, "said wireless transmitter is a BLUETOOTH wireless transmitter."

Regarding **claim 19**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31). Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings

into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "establish a commissioning session with a wireless device," and, "receive commissioning data from the wireless device; communicate service provisioning data to the communications network." The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed device that, "verify security mechanisms with the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 20**, Kaupe discloses that the installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed, "verifying security mechanisms with the wireless device may comprise the step of receiving a commissioning session request via the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 22**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "communicating service provisioning data to the communications network comprises communicating commissioning data to the communications network."

Regarding **claim 23**, Kaupe discloses a system where an installer brings into commission a satellite terminal via a PDA (see paragraphs 20 and 31), which reads on the claimed, "commissioning module for commissioning a network element in a

Art Unit: 2686

communications network via a wireless device, said commissioning module comprising: a network element, said network element comprising a wireless interface and a network interface; a wireless device, said wireless device comprising a wireless transmitter for coupling with the wireless interface on the network element.” Commissioning is initiated after the satellite terminal is taken out of pointing mode. The installer brings into commission the satellite terminal that has just been installed by communicating with the indoor unit via the PDA and the indoor unit, in turn, communicates with the NOCC. Data regarding the commissioning is uploaded to the PDA (see paragraph 31), and later uploaded to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, said commissioning module performs the steps of establishing a commissioning session with the wireless device,” and, “communicating commissioning data to the communications network via the wireless interface.” The commissioning data may include data relating to, for example, authentication, login and security (see paragraph 31), which reads on the claimed, “verifying security mechanisms with the wireless device.”

Regarding **claim 24**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, “said commissioning module further performs the steps of communicating service provisioning data to the communications network via the network interface.”

Regarding **claim 25**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, “said apparatus generates said service provisioning data.”

Regarding **claim 26**, Kaupe discloses that the PDA later uploads the commissioning data to the NSP (see paragraph 32), which reads on the claimed, "said apparatus receives said service provisioning data from said wireless interface."

Regarding **claim 27**, Regarding claim 16, Kaupe discloses the PDA communicates with the indoor device e.g. via Bluetooth signaling (see paragraph 28), which reads on the claimed, "said wireless transceiver comprises a BLUETOOTH transceiver."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 4, 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaupe in view of Toyoshima (US 20020085530A1).

Regarding **claim 4**, Kaupe discloses that the invention can be applied to any electronic equipment to change any parameter associated therewith (see paragraph 330. Kaupe fails to disclose that said communicating commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device comprises communicating an Internet protocol address for the network element.

In a similar field of endeavor, Toyoshima discloses activation of a device comprises providing an Internet protocol address (see paragraph 21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe with Toyoshima to include the above providing of an Internet protocol address in order to provide compatibility with devices that need an IP address to be activated.

Regarding **claim 8**, Kaupe discloses that the invention can be applied to any electronic equipment to change any parameter associated therewith (see paragraph 33). Kaupe fails to disclose that said communicating commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device comprises communicating an Internet protocol address for the network element.

In a similar field of endeavor, Toyoshima discloses activation of a device comprises providing an Internet protocol address (see paragraph 21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe with Toyoshima to include the above providing of an Internet protocol address in order to provide compatibility with devices that need an IP address to be activated.

Regarding **claim 21**, Kaupe discloses that the invention can be applied to any electronic equipment to change any parameter associated therewith (see paragraph 33). Kaupe fails to disclose that said communicating commissioning data to a communications network via the wireless device comprises communicating an Internet protocol address for the network element.

In a similar field of endeavor, Toyoshima discloses activation of a device comprises providing an Internet protocol address (see paragraph 21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe with Toyoshima to include the above providing of an Internet protocol address in order to provide compatibility with devices that need an IP address to be activated.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaupe in view of Torvinen (US 20050113123A1).

Regarding **claim 13**, Kaupe fails to disclose the apparatus further comprises an external body and said wireless interface is removable from said external body.

In a similar field of endeavor, Torvinen discloses a wireless device that may include a wireless interface module (see paragraph 74).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe with Torvinen to include the above use of a WIM in order to provide an easily to install and exchangeable interface.

Regarding **claim 14**, Kaupe fails to disclose the apparatus further comprises an external body and said wireless interface is removable from said external body.

In a similar field of endeavor, Torvinen discloses a wireless device that may include a SIM card (see paragraph 74).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe with Torvinen to include the above use of a SIM in order to provide an easily to install and exchangeable memory.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaupe in view of what was well known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03).

Regarding **claim 17**, Kaupe discloses that the invention can be applied to any electronic equipment to change any parameter associated therewith (see paragraph 33). Kaupe fails to expressly disclose that the apparatus is a wireless telephone.

The examiner takes official notice that wireless telephones were well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe such that the apparatus is a wireless telephone in order to extend the benefits disclosed by Kaupe, such as ease of configuration and set up (see paragraph 9) to wireless telephones.

Regarding **claim 18**, Kaupe discloses that the invention can be applied to any electronic equipment to change any parameter associated therewith (see paragraph 33). Kaupe fails to expressly disclose that the apparatus is a PDA.

The examiner takes official notice that PDAs were well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kaupe such that the apparatus is a wireless telephone in order to extend the benefits disclosed by Kaupe, such as ease of configuration and set up (see paragraph 9) to PDAs.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kurokawa (US 20040013247A1) discloses an internal information sharing system, call connection control server, wireless LAN telephone terminal apparatus and internal information sharing method thereof.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J. Fox whose telephone number is (571) 272-7908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2686

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bryan Fox
November 19, 2005.


CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER